

Appln. No. 10/646,972  
Amendment dated October 10, 2006  
Reply to Office Action dated April 17, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
OCT 10 2006

### Remarks

The foregoing amendments and these remarks are in response to the Office Action, dated April 17, 2006. At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-14 were pending in the present application. Claims 11 and 13 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 1 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 1 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 2-10 were indicated as being allowed. Each of the objections and rejections will be addressed in turn below.

### Informalities

In the Office Action, claims 11 and 13 were objected to because of informalities. The preamble of claim 11 was objected to because it was not consistent with the claims from which it depends. The Examiner suggesting changing the word "of" to "according to." In addition, the Office Action noted that the word "a" in line 3 is grammatically incorrect in the used context, and it was suggested that the "a" be deleted. Applicant has considered the objection and has amended claim 11 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is now in condition for allowance.

As for claim 13, the preamble was objected to for not being consistent with the remaining dependent claims. It was suggested that the word "of" be changed to "according to." Applicant has rewritten claim 13 into independent form, and it is respectfully submitted that claim 13, as amended, satisfactorily resolves the objection.

### 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶1 for its recitation of "a plurality of full diffuser vanes." As set forth in the listing of claims above, claims 1 and 12 have

Appln. No. 10/646,972  
Amendment dated October 10, 2006  
Reply to Office Action dated April 17, 2006

been cancelled. Claim 13 has been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of claim 1, except that claim 13 recites a "plurality of diffuser vanes." The recitation of a "plurality of diffuser vanes" is fully supported by the specification of the present application. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶1.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Turning to the art-based rejections, claims 1 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,011,371 to Gottemoller ("Gottemoller") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,019,927 to Galliger ("Galliger"). Applicant still believes that Gottemoller and Galliger are not properly combinable and, even assuming they are, the combination does not teach the inventions recited in claims 1 and 12. Nonetheless, Applicant has cancelled claims 1 and 12 to advance the prosecution. Thus, the rejection of these claims is now moot.

Claims 13-14

Claim 13 has been rewritten in independent form as indicated above. As noted above, claim 13, as amended, overcomes the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶1 as well as the objection based on informalities. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is in condition for allowance. Because it depends from claim 13, claim 14 is necessarily distinguishable over claim 13.


Appln. No. 10/646,972  
Amendment dated October 10, 2006  
Reply to Office Action dated April 17, 2006

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the objections and rejections raised in the Office Action have been satisfactorily addressed. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections and allowance pending claims 2-11 and 13-14. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/10/2006

  
Stephan A. Pendorf, USPTO Reg. No. 32,665  
Mark M. Zylka, USPTO Reg. No. 48,518  
AKERMAN SENTERFITT  
P.O. Box 3188  
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188  
Telephone: (561) 653-5000  
Facsimile: (561) 659-6313